

# **REMOVAL OF PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS BY ADSORPTION AND ADVANCED OXIDATION PROCESSES**

By

**Javeed Mohammed Abdul**



Submitted in fulfillment for the degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**Faculty of Engineering  
University of Technology, Sydney (UTS)  
Australia 2010**

## CERTIFICATE

I certify that this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not being submitted as part of candidature for any other degree.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me and that any help that I have received in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.



Signature of Candidate

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Javeed Mohammed Abdul", written over a horizontal dotted line.

(Javeed Mohammed Abdul)

# Acknowledgement

It was hard work, stress and fun during my doctoral research in university of technology, Sydney. It would not have been possible to accomplish this doctoral research without the help and support of people around me and they need a special mention here.

I am highly indebted to a plethora of people for their help and support during my research. My first thanks and gratitude goes to my principal supervisor Prof. S. Vigneswaran. He was a source of inspiration, motivation and strength throughout my research. His unwavering support during my rough rides kept me sailing to accomplish this research.

I would like to show my gratitude to my co-supervisors A.Prof. Hao.H.ngo and Dr. Jaya Kandasamy. A.Prof. Hao was instrumental in all my lab activities. He was friendly and always lends a supportive hand in my reseach. Dr. Jaya Kandasamy helped me in project modeling work and with thesis guidance. Dr. Robert McLaughlan was a curious mind who always provided me his valuable advice about my research. My special thanks to Prof. G.Mahinthankumar for his help with the modelling work.

It is a pleasure to thank Dr. Shon for his friendly smile and his HPLC knowledge that he passed on to me for my experimental work. My thanks to Dr. Gua, Dr Vinh and Dr. Rupak Aryal for their co-operation and help.

I would like to thank my colleagues and mates Lazlo, Joy, Dang, Jani, Than, Wen Xing, Jping, Ghausul, Yousuf, Ibrahim, Tamer, Zaheer, Chinu, Ben, Monami, Minn, Fabio, Debbie, and Greg. I had wonderful time with these guys.

I would like to acknowledge the project's financial funding from CRC CARE and, especially Prof. Ravi Naidu for his courteous help. I owe my thanks to academic and technical support of the University of Technology, Sydney and its staff, especially Phyllis for all my academic support.

Above all, I would like to thank my wife Nusrath and my children Heeba, Saba and Junaid for their personal support and great patience at all times. My family was always with me during the accomplishment of this doctoral research.

Thanks very much every one.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	i
Certificate	i
Table of contents	iii
Nomenclature	xiv
List of the tables	xviii
List of the figures	xxi
Abstract	xxx



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

	1-1
1.1 Introduction	1-2
1.2 Structure of the study	1-5
1.3 Objectives	1-8

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Contamination	2-5
2.2.1 Contamination due to the discharge of untreated landfill leachate	2-7
2.2.2 Contamination of surface and groundwater by pesticides (Metsulfuron methyl)	2-12
2.2.3 Contamination due to the discharge of pharmaceutically active compounds (PhAc'S)	2-15
2.2.4 Contamination due to the discharge of Persistent organic pollutant, POP, (Chlorophenols and Pentachlorophenol)	2-18
2.3 Removal of contaminants of by Adsorption	2-22
2.3.1 Adsorption Isotherm	2-24
2.3.2 Types of adsorption Isotherms	2-24
2.3.3 Adsorption Isotherm Equations	2-26
2.3.4 Adsorption in fixed beds	2-29
2.3.5 Bio-degradation /Bio-sorption	2-32
2.3.6 Adsorbent	2-34
2.4 Removal of contaminants by GAC adsorption	2-36
2.4.1 Removal of landfill leachate by GAC adsorption	2-36

2.4.2	Removal of MeS by GAC adsorption	2-38
2.4.3	Removal of TMP by GAC adsorption	2-39
2.4.4	Removal of PCP by GAC adsorption	2-41
2.5	Removal of contaminants by Advanced oxidation processes (AOPs)	2-43
2.5.1	Advanced oxidation processes (AOPs)	2-43
2.5.2	Common oxidants used in industry	2-46
2.5.2.1	Oxygen:	2-46
2.5.2.2	Ozone (O <sub>3</sub> )	2-46
2.5.2.3	Hydrogen peroxide (H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> )	2-47
2.5.3	Catalysts	2-47
2.5.4	Types of AOPs	2-48
2.5.4.1	Photochemical	2-49
2.5.4.2	Non-photochemical AOPs	2-52
2.5.5	Photocatalysis	2-54
2.5.6	Theory and mechanism of photocatalysis	2-54
2.5.7	Catalyst (TiO <sub>2</sub> ) Characteristics	2-58
2.5.8	Role of oxygen	2-58
2.5.9	Effect of pH	2-59
2.6	Photocatalysis of contaminants	2-60
2.6.1	Photocatalysis of landfill leachate	2-60
2.6.2	Photocatalysis of MeS	2-61
2.6.3	Photocatalysis of Trimethoprim (TMP)	2-65
2.6.4	Photocatalysis of pentachlorophenol (PCP)	2-70
2.7	Fenton's Process	2-75
2.7.1	Effect of pH	2-77
2.7.2	Ratio of H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> /Fe <sup>2+</sup>	2-80

2.8	Removal of contaminants by Fenton's Oxidation	2-82
2.8.1	Removal of landfill leachate by Fenton's Oxidation	2-82
2.8.2	Removal of MeS by Fenton's oxidation	2-85
2.8.3	Removal of TMP by Fenton's oxidation	2-87
2.8.4	Removal of PCP by Fenton's oxidation	2-88
2.9	Conclusions	2-95

## CHAPTER 3 3.1

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1	Introduction	3-2
3.2	Contaminants	3-2
3.2.1	Landfill leachate	3-2
3.2.2	Trimethoprim (TMP)	3-4
3.2.3	Metsulfuron methyl (MeS)	3-4
3.2.4	Pentachlorophenol (PCP)	3-5
3.3	Materials	3-6
3.3.1	Reagents and Chemicals	3-6
3.3.2	Materials	3-8
	3.3.2.1 Adsorbent (Granular Activated Carbon (GAC))	3-8
	3.3.2.2 Photocatalyst (Titanium Dioxide (TiO <sub>2</sub> ))	3-9
	3.3.2.3 Sand	3-10
3.4	Experimental Apparatus /Equipment	3-10
3.4.1	Mixer	3-10
3.4.2	Jar tester used for adsorption Kinetics	3-11
3.4.3	Multi-place magnetic stirrer	3-12

3.5	Experimental procedures	3-13
3.5.1	Adsorption	3-13
3.5.1.1	Batch adsorption Equilibrium	3-13
3.5.1.2	Fixed bed (Column)	3-14
3.5.2	Biodegradation /Biosorption	3-15
3.5.2.1	Batch	3-15
3.5.2.2	Column (Fixed bed)	3-16
3.5.3	Photocatalysis	3-17
3.5.3.1	Photo oxidation	3-17
3.5.4	Advanced oxidation	3-18
3.5.4.1	Batch Method	3-18
3.5.4.2	Fixed bed method	3-19
3.5.4.3	Combined process (Fenton's oxidation and GAC Adsorption) in Fixed beds	3-20
3.5.4.4	Toxicity (Bio assay) of degradation by-products of MeS by Fenton's Oxidation	3-21
3.5.4.4.1	Calculations and statistical analysis	3-23
3.6	Analytical methods	3-24
3.6.1	Total organic carbon measurement	3-24
3.6.2	UV measurement	3-25
3.6.2.1	Estimation of $\text{Fe}_{2+}$ , $\text{Fe}^{3+}$ and Total iron (Sulfosalicylic acid method):	3-25
3.6.2.2	Estimation of $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$	3-25
3.6.3	High pressure/performance liquid chromatographic (HPLC) measurement	3-26
3.6.3.1	HPLC method for MeS	3-26
3.6.3.1.1	Sample preparation	3-27
3.6.3.1.2	Column used	3-27

3.6.3.1.3	Mobile phase	3-27
3.6.3.1.4	HPLC analysis	3-28
3.6.3.2	HPLC method for PCP	3-29
3.6.3.2.1	Sample preparation	3-29
3.6.3.2.2	Column used	3-29
3.6.3.2.3	Mobile phase	3-30
3.6.3.2.4	HPLC analysis	3-30
3.6.4	Estimation of chloride by Ion Chromatography.	3-30

## CHAPTER 4 4.1

### **TREATMENT OF DILUTED SYNTHETIC LANDFILL LEACHATE BY ADSORPTION, BIO-SORPTION AND ADVANCED OXIDATION**

4.1	Introduction	4-2
4.2	Removal of Synthetic landfill leachate (SLL) by GAC Adsorption/Bio-sorption	4-5
4.2.1	Adsorption of SLL by GAC (Batch reactor)	4-6
4.2.1.1	Adsorption Equilibrium	4-6
4.2.1.2	Modeling	4-7
4.2.1.3	Adsorption kinetics	4-9
4.2.1.4	Batch Bio-sorption Experiments	4-10
4.2.1.5	Microbiological Analysis	4-13
4.2.2	Bio-sorption of SLL in GAC Fixed bed	4-14
4.2.2.1	Adsorption	4-15
4.2.2.2	Acclimatization	4-16
4.2.2.3	Biodegradation and bio-sorption	4-17



4.2.2.4 Mathematical Model	4-18
4.3 Removal of SLL by Photocatalysis	4-27
4.3.1 Recirculated photo-catalyst reactors	4-28
4.3.2 Effect of catalyst ( $\text{TiO}_2$ ) concentration on TOC (SLL) removal	4-29
4.3.3 Kinetics	4-30
4.4 Fenton's Process (Fenton's oxidation)	4-31
4.4.1 Effect of $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$ on TOC removal	4-35
4.4.2 Effect of $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$	4-36
4.4.3 Kinetics	4-37
4.4.4 Effect of initial SLL concentration	4-38
4.4.5 Oxidation reduction potential (ORP)	4-39
4.4.6 Effect of ratio of Fenton's reagent ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{Fe}^{2+}$ ) on TOC removal	4-41
4.5 Combined process for TOC removal of SLL	4-41
4.6 Comparison of TOC removal from SLL by adsorption/bio-sorption, photo catalysis, Fenton's oxidation and combined processes	4-42
4.7 Conclusions	4-43

## CHAPTER 5 5-1

### REMOVAL OF METSULFURON METHYL (MeS) BY DIFFERENT TREATMENT PROCESSES

5.1 Removal of MeS by adsorption	5-2
5.2 Adsorption Models	5-6
5.2.1 Adsorption Equilibrium	5-6
5.2.2 Adsorption Kinetics	5-6
5.2.3 Fixed bed adsorption	5-7
5.3 Experimental results on MeS adsorption on GAC	5-10

5.3.1	Adsorption equilibrium results	5-10
5.3.2	Isotherm	5-11
5.3.3	Adsorption kinetics- Batch	5-13
5.3.4	Adsorption (Column results)	5-15
5.4	Fenton's process (FP)	5-18
5.4.1	Kinetic scheme	5-19
5.4.2	Experimental results	5-23
5.4.2.1	Dose optimization	5-23
5.4.2.2	$\text{Fe}^{2+}$ residual at different $[\text{Fe}]_0$	5-26
5.4.2.3	Percent $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ consumed	5-27
5.4.2.4	Degradation of Fenton's reagent with no organics	5-28
5.4.2.5	Effect of $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 / [\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$ on MeS degradation	5-30
5.4.2.6	Effect of pH on MeS removal	5-31
5.4.2.7	Effect of $[\text{MeS}]_0$ on Fenton's oxidation (Oxidizing potential of Fenton's process)	5-32
5.4.2.8	Empirical modeling	5-33
5.4.2.9	Fenton modeling	5-35
5.4.2.10	Efficacy of model prediction	5-37
5.4.2.11	Dose optimization of $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ with Fenton's model	5-38
5.4.3	Toxicity of degradation by-products of MeS by Fenton's oxidation	5-40
5.4.3.1	Toxicity of Fenton's reagent (FR) in the absence of MeS	5-41
5.4.3.2	Toxicity of MeS after Fenton's Oxidation	5-42
5.4.3.3	Toxicity of different $[\text{MeS}]_0$ concentrations after Fenton's oxidation	5-43
5.4.3.4	Effect of organic matter (OM) on the degradation of MeS by Fenton oxidation	5-44
5.4.3.5	Toxicity of the residual solutions following Fenton's oxidation of MeS solutions	5-44

5.5	Photocatalysis of MeS	5-47
5.5.1	Effect of catalyst concentration	5-49
5.5.2	Effect of contaminant (MeS) concentration	5-50
5.6	Comparison of degradation of MeS Adsorption, Fenton's oxidation and PC	5-52
5.7	Conclusions	5-53

## CHAPTER 6 6-1

### REMOVAL OF PENTACHLOROPHENOL (PCP) BY DIFFERENT TREATMENT PROCESSES

6.1	Introduction	6-2
6.2	Removal of PCP by adsorption	6-4
6.2.1	Adsorption equilibrium experiments	6-4
6.2.2	Adsorption kinetics	6-7
6.2.3	Effect of pH	6-7
6.2.4	Adsorption of PCP on GAC	6-10
6.2.4.1	At pH 3	6-10
6.2.4.2	At pH 7	6-11
6.2.4.3	At pH 9	6-13
6.3	Removal of PCP by Advanced Oxidation Processes (AOPs)	6-15
6.3.1	Photocatalysis	6-16
6.3.1.1	The effect of catalyst on photo degradation of PCP	6-16
6.3.1.2	The Effect of TiO <sub>2</sub> Dose (Dose Optimization)	6-17
6.3.1.3	The Effect of [PCP] <sub>0</sub> Concentration	6-19
6.3.1.4	The Variation of pH and Cl <sup>-</sup> During the Photocatalysis Process	6-23
6.4	Removal of PCP by Fenton's oxidation	6-25

6.4.1	Effect of initial concentration of $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ ( $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$ ) on PCP degradation	6-26
6.4.2	Effect of initial concentration ( $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$ ) on PCP degradation	6-30
6.4.3	Residual concentration of Fenton's reagent	6-31
6.4.3.1	Residual $\text{Fe}^{2+}$	6-32
6.4.3.2	Amount of $\text{Fe}^{3+}$ liberated	6-32
6.4.3.3	Residual concentration of oxidant $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$	6-33
6.4.3.4	Degradation of PCP to lower chlorophenols	6-33
6.4.3.5	Oxidation of PCP to chloride	6-34
6.4.3.6	PCP mineralization	6-35
6.5	Conclusion	6-36

## CHAPTER 7

### REMOVAL OF TRIMETHOPRIM (TMP) A PHARMACEUTICAL ACTIVE SUBSTANCE, BY DIFFERENT TREATMENT PROCESSES

7.1	Introduction	7-1
7.2	Removal of Trimethoprim by GAC adsorption	7-5
7.2.1	Batch Equilibrium Experiments	7-5
7.2.2	Adsorption Kinetics	7-9
7.2.2.1	( Sips Kinetics (Modified Langmuir -Hinshelwood)	7-9
7.2.2.2	First Order Kinetics	7-10
7.2.2.3	Second order	7-10
7.2.2.4	Dual First order kinetics	7-11
7.2.3	Adsorption in fixed bed	7-13
7.2.3.1	Modelling	7-14

1.	Removal of TMP by Fenton' oxidation	7-16
7.3.1	Effect of initial Fenton's reagent (FR) concentration $[H_2O_2/Fe^{2+}]_0$	7-16
7.3.2	$H_2O_2$ consumed at different $[Fe^{2+}]_0$ concentration.	7-18
7.3.3	Fenton's oxidation kinetics	7-19
7.4	Photocatalysis	7-20
7.4.1	Effect of the catalyst ( $TiO_2$ ) dose	7-21
7.4.2	Effect of flow rate on the continuous photo-oxidation process	7-23
7.5	Conclusions	7-24

## CHAPTER 8

### ADVANCED OXIDATION OF METSULFURON-METHYL AND PENTACHOLOROPHENOL IN SOIL COLUMNS BY FENTON'S REAGENT: EXPERIMENTS AND MODELLING

8.1	Introduction	8-2
8.1.1	Fenton's oxidation in sand column (Fixed bed) Experiments	8-7
8.2	Adsorption of MeS in fixed bed	8-9
8.3	Fenton's oxidation of MeS in sand column (Fixed bed): Result	8-10
8.4	Column Modeling	8-13
8.5	Numerical Implementation	8-15
8.6	Model fitting with experimental data	8-16
8.7	Removal of MeS by combined process (Fenton's oxidation and GAC adsorption)	8-19
8.8	Adsorption of PCP in sand column (Fixed bed)	8-20
8.9	Fenton's oxidation of PCP in Fixed bed	8-22
8.10	CONCLUSIONS	8-25



**CHAPTER 9**

**CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS**

9.1	Conclusions	9-2
9.2	Recommendations	9-11
	References	R1
	Appendix A	A
	Publications from the study	

# NOMENCLATURE

$a_f$	=	specific surface area
$\alpha_L$	=	longitudinal dispersivity (cm)
$b$	=	constant (L/mg)
$b_{tot}$	=	total bio-film loss coefficient
$c_i$	=	fluid phase concentration (mg/L)
$c_s$	=	equilibrium concentration (mg/L)
$c_{pi}$	=	concentration inside particle (mg/L)
$C$	=	concentration of adsorbate in the bulk solution (mg/L)
$C_e$	=	equilibrium concentration of solute in the bulk of the solution
$D_s$	=	effective surface diffusion coefficient of organic ( $m^2/s$ )
$D_f$	=	diffusion coefficient ( $m^2/s$ )
$D_h$	=	hydrodynamic dispersion coefficient ( $cm^2/min$ )
$D_m$	=	molecular diffusivity ( $cm^2/min$ )
$D_{ax}$	=	axial dispersion coefficients, ( $m^2s^{-1}$ )
eV	=	electron volts
$F$	=	concentration of $H_2O_2$ in the Fenton's reagent ( $mg/cm^3$ )
KF	=	Freundlich constant
KW	=	kilo watt
$k_d$	=	adsorption distribution coefficient
$k_r$	=	desorption rate ( $min^{-1}$ )
$k_f$	=	overall mass transfer coefficient (m/s)
$K_f$	=	film mass transfer coefficient (m/s)
$k_m$	=	mass transfer coefficient (1/s)
$K_d$	=	decay coefficient ( $s^{-1}$ )

$K_S$	=	Monod half velocity coefficient
$k_s$	=	solid mass transfer coefficient (1/s)
$K_{\max}$	=	maximum rate of substrate utilization ( $s^{-1}$ )
$k_P$	=	particle phase mass transfer coefficient
$K_n$	=	limiting rate constants of reaction
$K$	=	reaction rate constant ( $h^{-1}$ )
$k_{YN}$	=	Yoon–Nelson rate constant ( $\min^{-1}$ )
$K_{obs}$	=	observed first order rate constant
$k$	=	adsorption rate constant for the column (l/min mg)
$k_T$	=	Thomas rate constant (l/min mg), is, is and
$K_r$	=	the reaction rate constant ( $h^{-1}$ )
$K_{ad}$	=	the adsorption distribution coefficient
$k_1$	=	faster initial rate
$k_2$	=	slower final rate
$k_3$	=	Constant
$k_4$	=	Constant
$k_5$	=	Constant
$k_6$	=	Constant
$k_7$	=	Constant
$k_8$	=	Constant
$L_f$	=	bio-film thickness (m)
$L$	=	height of the column bed (cm)
$m_C$	=	mass of adsorbent in the column (g)
$n$	=	Constant
$n$	=	Freundlich, Sips exponent
$N$	=	adsorbate uptake rate per pellet

$N_0$	=	adsorptive capacity of adsorbent (mg/l)
$P_n$	=	number of characteristic packing spheres
$q$	=	amount of adsorbate absorbed on adsorbent (mg/g)
$q_s$	=	adsorbed phase concentration at the external surface of adsorbent particle (mg/g)
$q_e$	=	amount of solute adsorbed per gram of adsorbent,
$q_m$	=	saturation amount of organic adsorbed (mg/g)
$q_0$	=	the maximum solid-phase concentration of the solute (mg/g)
$Q$	=	volumetric flow rate (l/min)
$R$	=	radius of adsorbent (m)
$R_p$	=	pellet radius (m)
$S$	=	sorbed phased concentration (mg/cm <sup>3</sup> of soil)
$T$	=	temperature ( <sup>0</sup> C)
$u$	=	velocity of the fluid, (ms <sup>-1</sup> )
$U$	=	linear flow velocity of the feed to the bed (m/min)
$V$	=	pore water velocity (cm/min)
$X_s$	=	suspended cell concentration
$X_f$	=	biomass density (mg/L)
$Y$	=	yield coefficient (mg/mg)
$z$	=	bed depth, (m)
$\rho_p$	=	density of particle (kg/m <sup>3</sup> )
$\varepsilon_b$	=	bed porosity
$\beta$	=	filtration efficiency
$\theta$	=	empty bed contact time
$\sigma$	=	bio-film shear loss coefficient
$\bar{q}$	=	average concentration of $q$
$\sigma$	=	shear Loss (s <sup>-1</sup> )

$\rho_p$	=	the density of particle ( $\text{kg/m}^3$ )
$\varepsilon_b$	=	bed porosity
$t_0$		approximate transition time from fast to slow
TEq	=	Toxicity Equivalents ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )
$\lambda_F$	=	self degradation rate of Fenton's reagent ( $\text{min}^{-1}$ )
$\lambda_c$		self degradation rate of contaminant ( $\text{min}^{-1}$ )

References	R1
Appendix A	A1



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Characteristics of landfill leachate at different age of landfill
Table 2.2	Aquifer contamination cases around the world
Table 2.3	Physical properties of Metsulfuron methyl (MeS)
Table 2.4	Contamination of different rivers by chlorophenols
Table 2.5	Isotherm equations used for single component adsorption system
Table 2.6	Isotherm equations used for multi component adsorption system
Table 2.7	Biodegradation of different contaminants by GAC
Table 2.8	Characteristics of different carbon materials (Adapted from(Cheremisinoff et al. 1980))
Table 2.9	Past studies on adsorption in the treatment of landfill leachate
Table 2.10	Oxidation potential of common oxidants
Table 2.11	Different AOP processes (Huang et al. 1993)
Table 2.12	The degraded hydroxylated isomers by products of MeS (Rafqah et al. 2005).
Table 2.13	Photocatalytic degradation of different pharmaceutical products
Table 2.14	The scheme of Fenton's oxidation
Table 2.15	Effect on biodegradability
Table 3.1	Composition of synthetic landfill leachate (SLL) [Hrapovic, 2001]
Table 3.2	Composition of Trimethoprim (TMP)
Table 3.3	Physical characteristics of Metsulfuron methyl
Table 3.4	Physical characteristics of Pentachlorophenol (PCP)
Table 3.5	Final concentration of nutrients added to the culture medium and samples
Table 3.6	Physical characteristics of Granular activated carbon (GAC) James Cumming and & Son Pty. Ltd., Australia.
Table 3.7	Physical characteristics of Titanium dioxide (TiO <sub>2</sub> )
Table 3.8	Characteristics of sand used
Table 4.1	Treatment processes for landfill leachate
Table 4.2	Summary of values of isotherm parameters
Table 4.3	Summary of column experiments
Table 4.4	Parameters used for model simulation of GAC bio-filter. The same

	parameters were used for all runs
Table 4.5	Integration of Fenton's oxidation with different treatment processes for the removal of COD /TOC of landfill leachate
Table 4.6	TOC removal of SLL by different processes.
Table 5.1	Physical properties of Metsulfuron methyl (MeS)
Table 5.2	Isotherm parameters used for adsorption of MeS onto the GAC
Table 5.3	Coefficients used to model adsorption of MeS onto the GAC
Table 5.4	Coefficients used to model the fixed bed adsorption of MeS using empirical equations
Table 5.5	Fitted dual first order constants
Table 5.6	Rate constants for the Fenton's oxidation of MeS
Table 5.7	Comparison of degradation of MeS by Fenton's oxidation and <i>Lemna</i> test (Toxicity equivalent (TEq) values)
Table 5.8	Comparison of degradation of MeS by Fenton's oxidation and Photocatalysis
Table 6.1	Properties of pentachlorophenol sodium salt
Table 6.2	Adsorption isotherms coefficients
Table 6.3	Adsorption kinetics coefficients pH 7
Table 6.4	Adsorption kinetics coefficients pH 9
Table 6.5	Optimization of PCP concentrations in the photo-catalytic oxidation process
Table 6.6	Rate constants for Sips model
Table 7.1	Coefficient used to model isotherms (TMP)
Table 7.2	Adsorption kinetics parameters for Sips Kinetics (Modified Langmuir-Hinshelwood)
Table 7.3	Adsorption kinetic parameters for dual first order kinetics
Table 7.4	Estimated parameters for semi-empirical models for the fixed bed adsorption of TMP
Table 8.1	Oxidants and their oxidation potentials
Table 8.2	Sampling point data
Table 8.3	Fitted model parameters for MeS and PCP
Table 8.4	PCP removed by Fenton's oxidation in sand column at 160 ml/min flow rate

Table 8.5      Fitted model parameters for MeS and PCP

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	Change in Mean annual groundwater use (GL) in Australia between 1983/84 and 1996/97 (Land and Water Australia 2001)
Figure 2.2	Mesulfuron methyl (MeS)
Figure 2.3a	Origin and contamination of aquatic environment by veterinary medicine (Kemper 2008)
Figure 2.3b	Origin and contamination of aquatic environment by human medicine (adapted from (Ellis 2006)
Figure 2.4	Dechlorination pathway of PCP in contaminated sediment (Masunaga et al., 1996)
Figure 2.5	Isotherm types
Figure 2.6	Type isotherms (Gregg et al. 1982).
Figure 2.7	Adsorption in Fixed beds
Figure 2.8	Advanced oxidation processes (Poyatos et al. 2010)
Figure 2.9	Photocatalysis mechanism (Ahmed et al. 2010)
Figure 2.10	Mechanism of photocatalytic degradation of MeS (adapted from (Rafqah et al. 2005)
Table 2.11	Photocatalysis of PCP (Mills et al. 1993)
Figure 2.12	Photocatalysis of PCP (Mills et al. 1993)
Figure 2.13	Effect of pH on $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ species
Figure 2.14	Solubility of $\text{Fe}^{3+}$ at different pH
Figure 2.15	Degradation of PCP by Photo Fenton (Proposed degradation pathway of pentachlorophenol (PCP) by the photo Fenton process in the presence and in the absence of humic acid (Fukushima et al. 2001).
Figure 2.16	Role of intermediates in the degradation of phenolic compounds (Du et al. 2006).
Figure 2.17	Degradation of PCP by Fenton's oxidation
Figure 3.1	Reciprocating mixer
Figure 3.2	Jar test apparatus
Figure 3.3	Multi stirrer plate (adapted from <a href="http://www.batco.com.au">http://www.batco.com.au</a> )
Figure 3.4	Schematic of Fixed bed (column) adsorption and bio-sorption



Figure 3.5	Experimental set up for batch bio-sorption
Figure 3.6	Experimental set up of bio-degradation experiments
Figure 3.7	Schematic of the photo-reactor (Adapted from Hao et al,2009)
Figure 3.8	Schematic of Fenton's oxidation in fixed bed (simulating a PRB)
Figure 3.9	Schematic of combined process (Fenton's Oxidation and GAC Adsorption) of MeS in Fixed bed
Figure 3.10	Schematic of Total Organic Carbon Analyzer
Figure 3.11	High-performance liquid Chromatography (HPLC, Jasco LC-2000Plus)
Figure 3.12	Retention time and peak intensity (HPLC) at different MeS concentrations
Figure 3.13	Ion chromatograph (Metrohm Ion Analysis,790 Personal IC)
Figure 4.1	Contribution of organic matter of SLL towards % TOC. (TOC 64 mg/L)
Figure 4.2	GAC adsorption isotherm curves (SLL; contact time = 3 days; stirring speed = 130 rpm; initial DOC = 65 mg/L.)
Figure 4.3	Adsorption rate of SLL by different initial weight of GAC (g/L)
Figure 4.4	Initial Adsorption in batch reactor
Figure 4.5	Bio-sorption in batch reactors (GAC weight 20,40and 60 g/L)
Figure 4.6	pH changes during Adsorption and Biodegradation
Figure 4.7	Microbial count on GAC particles
Figure 4.8	Adsorption equilibrium prior to bio-degradation
Figure 4.9	Initial adsorption in fixed beds (bio-filter)
Figure 4.10	Different processes in fixed bed biodegradation
Figure 4.11	Performance of GAC-packed bio-filters with time for 60 days in SLL
Figure 4.12	Recirculated photocatalytic batch reactor system
Figure 4.13	Effect of $\text{TiO}_2$ dose on TOC removal from SLL
Figure 4.14	Effect of PAC coating
Figure 4.15	Effect of $[\text{Fe}]_0$ on TOC removal of SLL (Initial TOC of SLL 64 mg/L; $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 400$ milli moles).
Figure 4.16	The effect of $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$ concentration on TOC removal
Figure 4.17	The kinetics of Fenton's oxidation on TOC removal
Figure 4.18	The effect of influent concentration on efficiency of Fenton's



- oxidation
- Figure 4.19 The variation of % TOC removed, %  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  residual and ORP in FO kinetics
- Figure 4.20 Effect of SLL concentration and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{Fe}^{2+}$  ratio on % TOC removal
- Figure 4.21 Comparison of Fenton and Fenton followed by bio-filter on % TOC removal
- Figure 5.1 Molecular structure of MeS
- Figure 5.2 Concentration decay ( $C/C_0$ ) of MeS concentration at different pH ( $C$  and  $C_0$  are the MeS concentrations)
- Figure 5.3 Percent MeS removed at different pH. Experimental values are shown by data points, and model predictions are represented by lines.
- Figure 5.4 Concentration decay ( $C/C_0$ ) of MeS with time in batch system with model results (where  $C_0$  and  $C$  are the influent and final residual MeS concentration (mg/L)). Experimental values are shown by data points, and model predictions are represented by lines.
- Figure 5.5 Percent MeS removed at varied bed depths ( $L$ ),  $C_0 = 10$  mg/l,  $U = 1$  m/hr, pH = 4.5
- Figure 5.6 Percent MeS removed at varied bed depths ( $L$ ),  $C_0 = 10$  mg/l,  $U = 1$  m/hr, pH = 4.5, Experimental values are shown by data points, and model predictions are represented by lines
- Figure 5.7 Percent MeS removed at varied bed depths ( $L$ ),  $C_0 = 10$  mg/l,  $U = 1$  m/hr, pH = 4.5, Experimental values are shown by data points, and model predictions are represented by lines.
- Figure 5.8 Effect of  $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$  on % degradation of MeS; Initial  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentration  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 60$  mg/L; Initial MeS concentration  $[\text{MeS}]_0 = 10$  mg/L.
- Figure 5.9 Effect of  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  concentration on percent degradation of MeS; ( $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0 = 10$  mg/L;  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  concentration 60, 225 and 450 mg/L.)
- Figure 5.10 Percent  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  residual at  $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$  of 2.5, 5, 10, and 15 mg/L at  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentration of 60 mg/L and  $[\text{MeS}]_0 = 10$  mg/L
- Figure 5.11 Percent  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  consumed at  $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$  of 0, 2.5, 5, 10, 15 mg/L and at  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  concentration of 60 mg/L and  $[\text{MeS}]_0 = 10$  ppm
- Figure 5.12  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  residual in the absence of organics; ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentration=

- 450mg/L)
- The  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  concentration was 450 mg/l (kept constant).
- Figure 5.13 Percent  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  consumed in the absence of organics;  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$  concentration = 450 mg/L.]
- Figure 5.14 MeS removed at different  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 / [\text{Fe}^{2+}]$  (mg/l)
- Figure 5.15 Effect of pH on Fenton's process (Fe 10 mg/L;  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  60 mg/L; MeS 10 mg/L)
- Figure 5.16 Percent MeS removed;  $[\text{MeS}]_0$  conc. at 5,10,20 and 40 mg/L [ $\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0 = 10$  mg/L ;  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 60$  mg/L.
- Figure 5.17 Degradation kinetics of MeS with increasing  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  concentration. The symbols indicate experimental values and the lines indicate modeled curves. The cumulative fit error is 0.0181.
- Figure 5.18 The experimental and Fenton model fitted curves for MeS degradation with increasing initial  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  concentration. The symbols indicate experimental values and the lines indicate modeled curves. The cumulative fit error is 0.0259.
- Figure 5.19 Model predicted  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentrations using the Fenton model along with the corresponding experimental values (corresponding to Figure 5.8). The symbols indicate experimental values and the lines indicate modeled curves. No fitting is performed.
- Figure 5.20 Model predicted (lines) and experimental (symbols) residual MeS concentrations with increasing initial MeS Concentrations. Experimental data corresponds to Figure 5.11 No fitting is performed.
- Figure 5.21 Dose optimization of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  for MeS removal. The experimental data corresponds to 2 hour removal corresponding to different  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  (circle) and MeS (triangle) concentrations.
- Figure 5.22 Toxicity to Lemna of Fenton oxidation reagents
- Figure 5.23 Comparison of measured concentration of MeS by HPLC analysis with Toxic Equivalents (TEq) estimated by the *Lemna* test. ( Samples of different MeS concentrations were treated with  $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$  conc. 0.18 mM,  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 6.6$  mM for 4 h. BDL = Below detection limit.)
- Figure 5.24 Effect of humic acid (OM) on degradation of MeS by Fenton's

- process at concentrations from 5 mg/L MeS to 70 or 80 mg/L MeS. Samples were oxidized for 4 hours with FR at concentrations of 0.18 mM  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  and 6.6 mM  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ .
- Figure 5.25 Comparison of residual concentrations of MeS (measured by HPLC) with toxicity to *Lemna* (TEq) following Fenton oxidation of solutions of different initial concentrations of MeS, in the presence of humic acid (OM) at 0, 0.2 and 2.0 mg/L.
- Figure 5.26 Degradation efficiency of MeS by photocatalysis ( $\text{TiO}_2$  0.2 g/L)
- Figure 5.27 Degradation efficiency of MeS (MSM) by photocatalysis ( $\text{TiO}_2$  0.2 g/L)
- Figure 5.28 Degradation efficiency of MeS (MSM) by Photocatalysis ( $\text{TiO}_2$  0.5 g/L)
- Figure 6.1 Chemical structure of PCP sodium salt
- Figure 6.2 Adsorption equilibrium of PCP on GAC (PCP concentration 1, 10 and 50 mg/L)
- Figure 6.3 Adsorption equilibrium of PCP on GAC ( $[\text{PCP}]_0$  1, and 50 mg/L)
- Figure 6.4 Forms of PCP at different pH
- Figure 6.5 Adsorption kinetics of PCP on GAC at pH 3
- Figure 6.6 Adsorption kinetics of PCP on GAC at pH 7
- Figure 6.7 Adsorption kinetics of PCP on GAC at pH 9
- Figure 6.8 Effect of pH on PCP adsorbed on GAC [ $\text{PCP} = 10 \text{ mg/L}$ ;  $\text{GAC} = 500 \text{ mg/L}$ ]
- Figure 6.9 The effect catalyst ( $\text{TiO}_2$ ) on PCP degradation [ $[\text{PCP}]_0 = 10 \text{ mg/L}$ ]
- Figure 6.10 Effect of  $\text{TiO}_2$  dose on the removal of PCP ( $[\text{PCP}]_0 = 10 \text{ ppm}$ )
- Figure 6.11 Effect of the initial  $[\text{PCP}]_0$  concentration on photo-oxidation ( $\text{TiO}_2 = 0.05 \text{ g.L}^{-1}$ )
- Figure 6.12 Effect of high  $[\text{PCP}]_0$  range of 40-80  $\text{mg.L}^{-1}$  on the photooxidation efficiency ( $\text{TiO}_2 = 0.1 \text{ g.L}^{-1}$ ).
- Figure 6.13 The variation of pH, chloride ion ( $\text{Cl}^-$ ) and PCP removal efficiency during the photocatalytic reaction. (Initial PCP concentrations = 40  $\text{mg.L}^{-1}$ ;  $\text{TiO}_2 = 0.1 \text{ g.L}^{-1}$ )
- Figure 6.14 Effect of initial concentration of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  on PCP degradation ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 = 225 \text{ mg/l}$ )



- Figure 6.15 Effect of initial concentration of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  on PCP degradation ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 = 225 \text{ mg/l}$ )
- Figure 6.16 Effect of  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  concentration on % PCP removal
- Figure 6.17 Residual concentration of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  after Fenton' oxidation ( $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 225 \text{ mg/}$ )
- Figure 6.18  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  mg/l produced ( $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 225 \text{ mg/}$ )
- Figure 6.19 Residual  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentration
- Figure 6.20 Dechlorination of PCP to chloride at different  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  and  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  concentration
- Figure 6.21 Percent PCP mineralization ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 = 550 \text{ mg/L}$ )
- Figure 7.1 Contamination routes of environment by pharmaceutically active substances (PhAcS) (adapted from (Ellis 2006))
- Figure 7.2 Effect of initial GAC weight on % TMP removed pH 3
- Figure 7.3 Effect of initial GAC weight on % TMP removed pH 7
- Figure 7.4 Effect of initial GAC weight on % TMP removed pH 10
- Figure 7.5 Adsorption kinetics modeling
- Figure 7.6 Adsorption model (fixed bed) at different GAC bed depths (TMP Conc. =  $10 \text{ mg/L}$ ; Column flow volume =  $1 \text{ ml/min}$ )
- Figure 7.7 Effect of  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  and  $[\text{Fe}]_0$  on % TMP removed  $[\text{TMP}]_0 = 50 \text{ mg/L}$ ; pH 2.5.
- Figure 7.8 Percent  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  consumed at different  $[\text{Fe}]_0$  concentration
- Figure 7.9 Fenton oxidation kinetics
- Figure 7.10 TMP removal by different treatment processes (adsorption contact time = 72 hours, mixing rate = 130 rpm,  $\text{TiO}_2$  dose =  $0.5 \text{ g/L}$ ; UV light intensity =  $92.32 \text{ mW/cm}^2$ ; temperature =  $25^\circ\text{C}$ )
- Figure 7.11 Effect of flow rate/detention time on the  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{UV}$  photocatalysis ( $\text{TiO}_2$  dose =  $0.5 \text{ g/L}$ ; TRI concentration =  $10 \text{ mg/L}$ ; UV light intensity =  $92.32 \text{ mW/cm}^2$ )
- Figure 8.1 Schematic of Fenton's oxidation of MeS in column
- Figure 8.2 Adsorption of MeS in sand column (Flow rate  $20 \text{ ml/min}$ )
- Figure 8.3 Impact of flow rate on MeS removal rate recorded at various times for four column lengths: (a) SP1, (b) SP2, (c) SP3, (d) SP4.
- Figure 8.4 MeS Removal rates with residence times for five different effluent

- collection times.
- Figure 8.5 Experimental and model fitted MeS breakthrough curves for column experiments without the Fenton's reagent (adsorption only case).
- Figure 8.6 MeS removal with residence time: Experimental values and fitted model values
- Figure 8.7 Schematic of combined process (Fenton's Oxidation and GAC Adsorption) of MeS in Fixed bed
- Figure 8.8 MeS Removal rates with residence times for five different effluent collection times.
- Figure 8.9 Adsorption of PCP on sand column at different SPs [PCP =10 mg/L; Flow rate 160 ml/min]
- Figure 8.10 Experimental and model fitted PCP breakthrough curves for column experiments without the Fenton's reagent (adsorption only case).
- Figure 8.11 Removal of PCP by Fenton's oxidation in sand columns [PCP =10 mg/L;  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  =60 mg/L;  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  10 mg/L; Flow rate 160 ml/min]
- Figure 8.12 PCP removal with residence time: Experimental values and fitted model values

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Characteristics of landfill leachate at different age of landfill
Table 2.2	Aquifer contamination cases around the world
Table 2.3	Physical properties of Metsulfuron methyl (MeS)
Table 2.4	Contamination of different rivers by chlorophenols
Table 2.5	Isotherm equations used for single component adsorption system
Table 2.6	Isotherm equations used for multi component adsorption system
Table 2.7	Biodegradation of different contaminants by GAC
Table 2.8	Characteristics of different carbon materials (Adapted from(Cheremisinoff et al. 1980))
Table 2.9	Past studies on adsorption in the treatment of landfill leachate
Table 2.10	Oxidation potential of common oxidants
Table 2.11	Different AOP processes (Huang et al. 1993)
Table 2.12	The degraded hydroxylated isomers by products of MeS (Rafqah et al. 2005).
Table 2.13	Photocatalytic degradation of different pharmaceutical products
Table 2.14	The scheme of Fenton's oxidation
Table 2.15	Effect on biodegradability
Table 3.1	Composition of synthetic landfill leachate (SLL) [Hrapovic, 2001]
Table 3.2	Composition of Trimethoprim (TMP)
Table 3.3	Physical characteristics of Metsulfuron methyl
Table 3.4	Physical characteristics of Pentachlorophenol (PCP)
Table 3.5	Final concentration of nutrients added to the culture medium and samples
Table 3.6	Physical characteristics of Granular activated carbon (GAC) James Cumming and & Son Pty. Ltd., Australia.
Table 3.7	Physical characteristics of Titanium dioxide (TiO <sub>2</sub> )
Table 3.8	Characteristics of sand used
Table 4.1	Treatment processes for landfill leachate
Table 4.2	Summary of values of isotherm parameters
Table 4.3	Summary of column experiments
Table 4.4	Parameters used for model simulation of GAC bio-filter. The same



	parameters were used for all runs
Table 4.5	Integration of Fenton's oxidation with different treatment processes for the removal of COD /TOC of landfill leachate
Table 4.6	TOC removal of SLL by different processes.
Table 5.1	Physical properties of Metsulfuron methyl (MeS)
Table 5.2	Isotherm parameters used for adsorption of MeS onto the GAC
Table 5.3	Coefficients used to model adsorption of MeS onto the GAC
Table 5.4	Coefficients used to model the fixed bed adsorption of MeS using empirical equations
Table 5.5	Fitted dual first order constants
Table 5.6	Rate constants for the Fenton's oxidation of MeS
Table 5.7	Comparison of degradation of MeS by Fenton's oxidation and <i>Lemna</i> test (Toxicity equivalent (TEq) values)
Table 5.8	Comparison of degradation of MeS by Fenton's oxidation and Photocatalysis
Table 6.1	Properties of pentachlorophenol sodium salt
Table 6.2	Adsorption isotherms coefficients
Table 6.3	Adsorption kinetics coefficients pH 7
Table 6.4	Adsorption kinetics coefficients pH 9
Table 6.5	Optimization of PCP concentrations in the photo-catalytic oxidation process
Table 6.6	Rate constants for Sips model
Table 7.1	Coefficient used to model isotherms (TMP)
Table 7.2	Adsorption kinetics parameters for Sips Kinetics (Modified Langmuir-Hinshelwood)
Table 7.3	Adsorption kinetic parameters for dual first order kinetics
Table 7.4	Estimated parameters for semi-empirical models for the fixed bed adsorption of TMP
Table 8.1	Oxidants and their oxidation potentials
Table 8.2	Sampling point data
Table 8.3	Fitted model parameters for MeS and PCP
Table 8.4	PCP removed by Fenton's oxidation in sand column at 160 ml/min flow rate

Table 8.5            Fitted model parameters for MeS and PCP

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	Change in Mean annual groundwater use (GL) in Australia between 1983/84 and 1996/97 (Land and Water Australia 2001)
Figure 2.2	Mesulfuron methyl (MeS)
Figure 2.3a	Origin and contamination of aquatic environment by veterinary medicine (Kemper 2008)
Figure 2.3b	Origin and contamination of aquatic environment by human medicine (adapted from (Ellis 2006)
Figure 2.4	Dechlorination pathway of PCP in contaminated sediment (Masunaga et al., 1996)
Figure 2.5	Isotherm types
Figure 2.6	Type isotherms (Gregg et al. 1982).
Figure 2.7	Adsorption in Fixed beds
Figure 2.8	Advanced oxidation processes (Poyatos et al. 2010)
Figure 2.9	Photocatalysis mechanism (Ahmed et al. 2010)
Figure 2.10	Mechanism of photocatalytic degradation of MeS (adapted from (Rafqah et al. 2005)
Table 2.11	Photocatalysis of PCP (Mills et al. 1993)
Figure 2.12	Photocatalysis of PCP (Mills et al. 1993)
Figure 2.13	Effect of pH on $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ species
Figure 2.14	Solubility of $\text{Fe}^{3+}$ at different pH
Figure 2.15	Degradation of PCP by Photo Fenton (Proposed degradation pathway of pentachlorophenol (PCP) by the photo Fenton process in the presence and in the absence of humic acid (Fukushima et al. 2001).
Figure 2.16	Role of intermediates in the degradation of phenolic compounds (Du et al. 2006).
Figure 2.17	Degradation of PCP by Fenton's oxidation
Figure 3.1	Reciprocating mixer
Figure 3.2	Jar test apparatus
Figure 3.3	Multi stirrer plate (adapted from <a href="http://www.batco.com.au">http://www.batco.com.au</a> )
Figure 3.4	Schematic of Fixed bed (column) adsorption and bio-sorption

Figure 3.5	Experimental set up for batch bio-sorption
Figure 3.6	Experimental set up of bio-degradation experiments
Figure 3.7	Schematic of the photo-reactor (Adapted from Hao et al,2009)
Figure 3.8	Schematic of Fenton's oxidation in fixed bed (simulating a PRB)
Figure 3.9	Schematic of combined process (Fenton's Oxidation and GAC Adsorption) of MeS in Fixed bed
Figure 3.10	Schematic of Total Organic Carbon Analyzer
Figure 3.11	High-performance liquid Chromatography (HPLC, Jasco LC-2000Plus)
Figure 3.12	Retention time and peak intensity (HPLC) at different MeS concentrations
Figure 3.13	Ion chromatograph (Metrohm Ion Analysis,790 Personal IC)
Figure 4.1	Contribution of organic matter of SLL towards % TOC. (TOC 64 mg/L)
Figure 4.2	GAC adsorption isotherm curves (SLL; contact time = 3 days; stirring speed = 130 rpm; initial DOC = 65 mg/L.)
Figure 4.3	Adsorption rate of SLL by different initial weight of GAC (g/L)
Figure 4.4	Initial Adsorption in batch reactor
Figure 4.5	Bio-sorption in batch reactors (GAC weight 20,40and 60 g/L)
Figure 4.6	pH changes during Adsorption and Biodegradation
Figure 4.7	Microbial count on GAC particles
Figure 4.8	Adsorption equilibrium prior to bio-degradation
Figure 4.9	Initial adsorption in fixed beds (bio-filter)
Figure 4.10	Different processes in fixed bed biodegradation
Figure 4.11	Performance of GAC-packed bio-filters with time for 60 days in SLL
Figure 4.12	Recirculated photocatalytic batch reactor system
Figure 4.13	Effect of $\text{TiO}_2$ dose on TOC removal from SLL
Figure 4.14	Effect of PAC coating
Figure 4.15	Effect of $[\text{Fe}]_0$ on TOC removal of SLL (Initial TOC of SLL 64 mg/L; $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 400$ milli moles).
Figure 4.16	The effect of $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$ concentration on TOC removal
Figure 4.17	The kinetics of Fenton's oxidation on TOC removal
Figure 4.18	The effect of influent concentration on efficiency of Fenton's



oxidation

- Figure 4.19 The variation of % TOC removed, %  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  residual and ORP in FO kinetics
- Figure 4.20 Effect of SLL concentration and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{Fe}^{2+}$  ratio on % TOC removal
- Figure 4.21 Comparison of Fenton and Fenton followed by bio-filter on % TOC removal
- Figure 5.1 Molecular structure of MeS
- Figure 5.2 Concentration decay ( $C/C_0$ ) of MeS concentration at different pH ( $C$  and  $C_0$  are the MeS concentrations)
- Figure 5.3 Percent MeS removed at different pH. Experimental values are shown by data points, and model predictions are represented by lines.
- Figure 5.4 Concentration decay ( $C/C_0$ ) of MeS with time in batch system with model results (where  $C_0$  and  $C$  are the influent and final residual MeS concentration (mg/L)). Experimental values are shown by data points, and model predictions are represented by lines.
- Figure 5.5 Percent MeS removed at varied bed depths ( $L$ ),  $C_0 = 10$  mg/l,  $U = 1$  m/hr, pH = 4.5
- Figure 5.6 Percent MeS removed at varied bed depths ( $L$ ),  $C_0 = 10$  mg/l,  $U = 1$  m/hr, pH = 4.5, Experimental values are shown by data points, and model predictions are represented by lines
- Figure 5.7 Percent MeS removed at varied bed depths ( $L$ ),  $C_0 = 10$  mg/l,  $U = 1$  m/hr, pH = 4.5, Experimental values are shown by data points, and model predictions are represented by lines.
- Figure 5.8 Effect of  $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$  on % degradation of MeS; Initial  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentration  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 60$  mg/L; Initial MeS concentration  $[\text{MeS}]_0 = 10$  mg/L.
- Figure 5.9 Effect of  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  concentration on percent degradation of MeS; ( $\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0 = 10$  mg/L;  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  concentration 60, 225 and 450 mg/L.)
- Figure 5.10 Percent  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  residual at  $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$  of 2.5, 5, 10, and 15 mg/L at  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentration of 60 mg/L and  $[\text{MeS}]_0 = 10$  mg/L
- Figure 5.11 Percent  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  consumed at  $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$  of 0, 2.5, 5, 10, 15 mg/L and at  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  concentration of 60 mg/L and  $[\text{MeS}]_0 = 10$  ppm
- Figure 5.12  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  residual in the absence of organics; ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentration=

450mg/L)

The  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  concentration was 450 mg/l (kept constant).

- Figure 5.13 Percent  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  consumed in the absence of organics;  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$  concentration = 450 mg/L.]
- Figure 5.14 MeS removed at different  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 / [\text{Fe}^{2+}]$  (mg/l)
- Figure 5.15 Effect of pH on Fenton's process (Fe 10 mg/L;  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  60 mg/L; MeS 10 mg/L)
- Figure 5.16 Percent MeS removed;  $[\text{MeS}]_0$  conc. at 5,10,20 and 40 mg/L [ $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0 = 10$  mg/L ;  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 60$  mg/L.
- Figure 5.17 Degradation kinetics of MeS with increasing  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  concentration. The symbols indicate experimental values and the lines indicate modeled curves. The cumulative fit error is 0.0181.
- Figure 5.18 The experimental and Fenton model fitted curves for MeS degradation with increasing initial  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  concentration. The symbols indicate experimental values and the lines indicate modeled curves. The cumulative fit error is 0.0259.
- Figure 5.19 Model predicted  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentrations using the Fenton model along with the corresponding experimental values (corresponding to Figure 5.8). The symbols indicate experimental values and the lines indicate modeled curves. No fitting is performed.
- Figure 5.20 Model predicted (lines) and experimental (symbols) residual MeS concentrations with increasing initial MeS Concentrations. Experimental data corresponds to Figure 5.11 No fitting is performed.
- Figure 5.21 Dose optimization of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  for MeS removal. The experimental data corresponds to 2 hour removal corresponding to different  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  (circle) and MeS (triangle) concentrations.
- Figure 5.22 Toxicity to Lemna of Fenton oxidation reagents
- Figure 5.23 Comparison of measured concentration of MeS by HPLC analysis with Toxic Equivalents (TEq) estimated by the *Lemna* test. ( Samples of different MeS concentrations were treated with  $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$  conc. 0.18 mM,  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 6.6$  mM for 4 h. BDL = Below detection limit.)
- Figure 5.24 Effect of humic acid (OM) on degradation of MeS by Fenton's



process at concentrations from 5 mg/L MeS to 70 or 80 mg/L MeS. Samples were oxidized for 4 hours with FR at concentrations of 0.18 mM  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  and 6.6 mM  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ .

- Figure 5.25 Comparison of residual concentrations of MeS (measured by HPLC) with toxicity to *Lemna* (TEq) following Fenton oxidation of solutions of different initial concentrations of MeS, in the presence of humic acid (OM) at 0, 0.2 and 2.0 mg/L.
- Figure 5.26 Degradation efficiency of MeS by photocatalysis ( $\text{TiO}_2$  0.2 g/L)
- Figure 5.27 Degradation efficiency of MeS (MSM) by photocatalysis ( $\text{TiO}_2$  0.2 g/L)
- Figure 5.28 Degradation efficiency of MeS (MSM) by Photocatalysis ( $\text{TiO}_2$  0.5 g/L)
- Figure 6.1 Chemical structure of PCP sodium salt
- Figure 6.2 Adsorption equilibrium of PCP on GAC (PCP concentration 1, 10 and 50 mg/L)
- Figure 6.3 Adsorption equilibrium of PCP on GAC ( $[\text{PCP}]_0$  1, and 50 mg/L)
- Figure 6.4 Forms of PCP at different pH
- Figure 6.5 Adsorption kinetics of PCP on GAC at pH 3
- Figure 6.6 Adsorption kinetics of PCP on GAC at pH 7
- Figure 6.7 Adsorption kinetics of PCP on GAC at pH 9
- Figure 6.8 Effect of pH on PCP adsorbed on GAC [ $\text{PCP} = 10 \text{ mg/L}$ ;  $\text{GAC} = 500 \text{ mg/L}$ ]
- Figure 6.9 The effect catalyst ( $\text{TiO}_2$ ) on PCP degradation [ $[\text{PCP}]_0 = 10 \text{ mg/L}$ ]
- Figure 6.10 Effect of  $\text{TiO}_2$  dose on the removal of PCP ( $[\text{PCP}]_0 = 10 \text{ ppm}$ )
- Figure 6.11 Effect of the initial  $[\text{PCP}]_0$  concentration on photo-oxidation ( $\text{TiO}_2 = 0.05 \text{ g.L}^{-1}$ )
- Figure 6.12 Effect of high  $[\text{PCP}]_0$  range of 40-80  $\text{mg.L}^{-1}$  on the photooxidation efficiency ( $\text{TiO}_2 = 0.1 \text{ g.L}^{-1}$ ).
- Figure 6.13 The variation of pH, chloride ion ( $\text{Cl}^-$ ) and PCP removal efficiency during the photocatalytic reaction. (Initial PCP concentrations = 40  $\text{mg.L}^{-1}$ ;  $\text{TiO}_2 = 0.1 \text{ g.L}^{-1}$ )
- Figure 6.14 Effect of initial concentration of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  on PCP degradation ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 = 225 \text{ mg/l}$ )

- Figure 6.15 Effect of initial concentration of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  on PCP degradation ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 = 225 \text{ mg/l}$ )
- Figure 6.16 Effect of  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  concentration on % PCP removal
- Figure 6.17 Residual concentration of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  after Fenton' oxidation ( $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 225 \text{ mg/}$ )
- Figure 6.18  $\text{Fe}^{3+} \text{ mg/l}$  produced ( $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 = 225 \text{ mg/}$ )
- Figure 6.19 Residual  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentration
- Figure 6.20 Dechlorination of PCP to chloride at different  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  and  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  concentration
- Figure 6.21 Percent PCP mineralization ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 = 550 \text{ mg/L}$ )
- Figure 7.1 Contamination routes of environment by pharmaceutically active substances (PhAcS) (adapted from (Ellis 2006))
- Figure 7.2 Effect of initial GAC weight on % TMP removed pH 3
- Figure 7.3 Effect of initial GAC weight on % TMP removed pH 7
- Figure 7.4 Effect of initial GAC weight on % TMP removed pH 10
- Figure 7.5 Adsorption kinetics modeling
- Figure 7.6 Adsorption model (fixed bed) at different GAC bed depths (TMP Conc. =  $10 \text{ mg/L}$ ; Column flow volume =  $1 \text{ ml/min}$ )
- Figure 7.7 Effect of  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  and  $[\text{Fe}]_0$  on % TMP removed  $[\text{TMP}]_0 = 50 \text{ mg/L}$ ; pH 2.5.
- Figure 7.8 Percent  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  consumed at different  $[\text{Fe}]_0$  concentration
- Figure 7.9 Fenton oxidation kinetics
- Figure 7.10 TMP removal by different treatment processes (adsorption contact time = 72 hours, mixing rate = 130 rpm,  $\text{TiO}_2$  dose =  $0.5 \text{ g/L}$ ; UV light intensity =  $92.32 \text{ mW/cm}^2$ ; temperature =  $25^\circ\text{C}$ )
- Figure 7.11 Effect of flow rate/detention time on the  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{UV}$  photocatalysis ( $\text{TiO}_2$  dose =  $0.5 \text{ g/L}$ ; TRI concentration =  $10 \text{ mg/L}$ ; UV light intensity =  $92.32 \text{ mW/cm}^2$ )
- Figure 8.1 Schematic of Fenton's oxidation of MeS in column
- Figure 8.2 Adsorption of MeS in sand column (Flow rate  $20 \text{ ml/min}$ )
- Figure 8.3 Impact of flow rate on MeS removal rate recorded at various times for four column lengths: (a) SP1, (b) SP2, (c) SP3, (d) SP4.
- Figure 8.4 MeS Removal rates with residence times for five different effluent

- collection times.
- Figure 8.5 Experimental and model fitted MeS breakthrough curves for column experiments without the Fenton's reagent (adsorption only case).
- Figure 8.6 MeS removal with residence time: Experimental values and fitted model values
- Figure 8.7 Schematic of combined process (Fenton's Oxidation and GAC Adsorption) of MeS in Fixed bed
- Figure 8.8 MeS Removal rates with residence times for five different effluent collection times.
- Figure 8.9 Adsorption of PCP on sand column at different SPs [PCP =10 mg/L; Flow rate 160 ml/min]
- Figure 8.10 Experimental and model fitted PCP breakthrough curves for column experiments without the Fenton's reagent (adsorption only case).
- Figure 8.11 Removal of PCP by Fenton's oxidation in sand columns [PCP =10 mg/L;  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  =60 mg/L;  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  10 mg/L; Flow rate 160 ml/min]
- Figure 8.12 PCP removal with residence time: Experimental values and fitted model values

## ABSTRACT

Water scarcity due to persistent drought is forcing the countries around the world to explore alternative fresh water resources. Groundwater is one of the natural freshwater resources that can be used for human and agricultural use. But, contamination due to improper disposal of untreated human and industrial wastes affects the groundwater quality and renders it unsuitable for human and agricultural purpose unless the water is treated for contamination removal. Some of the common contaminants that contaminate groundwater are: landfill leachate from domestic landfills, Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) such as pesticides (Metsulfuron methyl-MeS), Pharmaceutically Active Substances (PhAcS-Trimethoprim (TMP) and pentachlorophenol (PCP). These contaminants cannot be removed effectively by conventional treatment processes such as coagulation, adsorption and are not easily bio-degradable. Therefore, Advanced Oxidation Processes (AOPs) are preferably being used to remove these contaminants of concern because of their effectiveness against bio-refractory contaminants, faster degradation kinetics and economic viability. Common AOPs include: Photocatalysis; Fenton's oxidation; Ozonation and their combinations. Our study used Adsorption/bio-sorption (conventional treatment process) and Photocatalysis and Fenton's oxidation (AOPs) for the degradation of above mentioned contaminants.



### **Synthetic Landfill Leachate (SLL)**

The adsorption/bio-degradation of diluted Landfill Leachate representing contaminated ground water on granular activated carbon was investigated both in batch and column (fixed bed studies) modes. The total organic carbon (TOC) (64 mg/l) removed due to adsorption by 20, 40, 60 g/l GAC was 44, 48 and 63%, whereas bio-degradation removed 85, 92 and 97% TOC respectively. The biodegradation of TOC was supported by consistent increase in microbial count on GAC particles. The Langmuir and Sips adsorption isotherms were found to fit well with the batch equilibrium. A mathematical model was developed to simulate the organics removal efficiency of the GAC bio-filtration system. In the combined process, a pre-treatment of SLL by Fenton's oxidation followed by bio-filtration led to an organic removal of 75% (an improvement of 15% over only biodegradation) even with a small oxidant ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ ) dose of as low as 200-800 milli mole/L and  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  of 15 milli moles. Photocatalysis with  $\text{TiO}_2$  as catalyst degraded SLL by only 30%.

### **Metsulfuron methyl (MeS) - an Herbicide**

The GAC adsorption removed more than 90% of MeS for an initial MeS concentration  $[\text{MeS}]_0$  of 50 mg/L. The adsorption and kinetics of MeS on GAC were a function of the solution pH. The linear driving force approximation (LDFA) kinetic equation with Langmuir and Freundlich adsorption isotherm models were successfully applied to predict the batch adsorption kinetics data in various concentrations of MeS. The Bohart-Adams and Thomas models were found to best simulate the fixed bed adsorption of MeS.

The Fenton's process was very effective in the degradation of MeS. The MeS was degraded by more than 99% at a reaction time of 2 h and more at the optimum Fenton's reagent concentration. The results suggested that as long as a minimum threshold level of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  (i.e., 60 mg/L) is applied, the long term (more than 1 hour) removal of MeS is primarily affected by the initial  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  and MeS concentrations. The Fenton's process was successfully modeled using an 8-reaction, 2<sup>nd</sup> order kinetic model.

The removal of MeS by photocatalysis with  $\text{TiO}_2$  was not effective as Fenton's oxidation. This study also investigated the toxicity of degradation by-products due to Fenton's oxidation of MeS. The herbicide toxicity of the parent and degradation by-products of MeS after Fenton's oxidation was determined by toxicological bioassay. The plant selected for this bioassay was the small aquatic flowering plant *Lemna disperma*, commonly known as duckweed, which is sensitive to MeS. The measured toxicity to *Lemna* in these treated samples was comparable to the concentrations of MeS measured by chemical method (HPLC/UV) detection.

### **Pentachlorophenol (PCP)**

The removal of PCP from contaminated aqueous solution was investigated by GAC adsorption, photocatalysis and Fenton's oxidation processes. Adsorption by GAC was very successful in removing PCP from aqueous solution even with very small quantities of GAC. The adsorption efficiency was highest at lower pH. The adsorption of PCP on GAC occurred in two phases; a faster and a slower phase. This was modeled.

The combination of UV/  $\text{TiO}_2$  photocatalysis removed PCP completely within 30 minutes of reaction. Significant degradation of PCP was achieved even with a very low



dose of  $\text{TiO}_2$  of  $0.05 \text{ g.L}^{-1}$  (for  $[\text{PCP}]_0$  range of  $10\text{-}40 \text{ mg.L}^{-1}$ ) and  $0.1 \text{ g.L}^{-1}$  (for  $[\text{PCP}]_0$  of  $60\text{-}80 \text{ mg.L}^{-1}$ ). The first order and Sips kinetics were successfully used to predict the degradation rate of organic contaminants. The chemical analysis of  $\text{Cl}^-$  and PCP and calculation from chemical formula showed that only 44.8% PCP was completely mineralized although all 100% pure PCP underwent degradation to lower chlorinated phenol and other compounds.

Fenton's process was very effective in PCP degradation. The PCP degradation by Fenton oxidation was a function of initial concentration of FR and their ratio ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  and  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ ), PCP (organic loading) and initial solution pH. The Sips Kinetic equation gave the best fit with the experimental data among different kinetic models tried.

### **Trimethoprim (TMP)**

The removal of TMP by GAC adsorption was investigated at alkaline and acidic conditions. The percent TMP removed by  $500 \text{ mg/L}$  GAC at pH 3, 7 and 10 was 62.5, 82.5 and 99% respectively. Sips isotherm and dual first order kinetics explained the equilibrium and kinetic adsorption results. The removal of TMP in a GAC column (fixed bed) was also studied using 3 different shallow GAC bed heights of 2.5, 5 and 10 cm. Overall, the fit of the Thomas model was the best for fixed bed adsorption of TMP as indicated by the higher  $r^2$  values.

In Fenton's oxidation the percent TMP removed was a function of initial FR dose. The  $[\text{Fe}^{2+}]_0$  concentration for maximum TMP removal of 60% at an optimum  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0$  concentrations of  $1.2 \text{ g/L}$  was  $100 \text{ mg/L}$ . The effect of catalyst concentration on the removal of TMP was more pronounced than the oxidant concentration.

Photocatalysis ( $\text{TiO}_2/\text{UV}$ ) decomposed 80% of TMP concentration within 180 minutes of irradiation. The optimum  $\text{TiO}_2$  dose was 0.5 g/L which degraded TMP by 82% for an initial TMP concentration of 10 mg/L. In the continuous system, the feed flow rate through the photoreactor or detention time was an important factor in enhancing the TMP removal. A detention time of 50 minutes achieved 55% TMP removal.

### **In-situ Fenton's oxidation (ISFO) of MeS and PCP**

In-situ contaminant reduction was investigated in sand columns (fixed beds). Both adsorption and Fenton's oxidation mechanisms were taken into account in ISFO to calculate the MeS removed. The In-situ Fenton's oxidation of MeS showed that for the transport and degradation of MeS in the column the residence time was the primary factor in determining the amount of MeS removal. The transport and degradation of MeS was modeled using the advection diffusion equation with reactions and rate limited sorption. The steady state adsorption of PCP in the sand filter was higher compared to that observed for MeS. The PCP removed by in-situ Fenton's oxidation was in the range of 80-90%. The in-situ Fenton's oxidation of PCP also showed that the residence time was the primary factor responsible in determining the amount of contaminant removal. Adsorption and Fenton's oxidation of PCP in the sand column was satisfactorily modeled in the same manner as MeS.